ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL HAZARDOUS WASTE PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING: TRANSCRIPT

AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE DU CONSEIL DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT SUR LES DECHETS DANGEREUX: COMPTE RENDU

BATHURST, NEW BRUNSWICK/NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK

MARCH 6, 1986/LE 6 MARS 1986

Conseil de
l'environnement
du Nouveau-Brunswick: 1986

New Brunswick
Environmental
Council: 1986

INDEX OF SPEAKERS/LISTE DES ORATEURS

MR. G. ASSAFF 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 61, 64

MR. A. CHAMBERLAIN 41, 43

M. F. CORMIER 44, 46, 47, 48, 49

MR. P. CORMIER 34, 35, 36, 37, 66

MR. K. FRENETTE . . 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 58, 59, 60, 61

MLLE S. GODIN . . . 8, 10, 25, 40, 42, 47, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60

MR. G. HILL 38, 39, 40, 57, 58, 62, 63, 65, 67

MR. KENNY 49, 54, 55, 56

MR. D. KERR 11, 19

MR. K. LANGMAID 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 36, 43, 52, 67

DR. L. LAPIERRE . . . 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67

MF P. MONTI 62

MR. R. PLAYFAIR . . . 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 53, 54

MR. D. SMITH . . . 19, 21, 22, 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 66, 67

MRS. H. TAYLOR 14, 43, 52, 54

(Due to technical difficulties, the opening remarks of this meeting were not tape-recorded. Therefore, we have substituted the opening remarks made by the Chairman, Mr. LaPierre, at the Campbellton session.

En raison de difficultés techniques, on n'a pas pu enregistrer le discours de bienvenue du président, M. LaPierre. En guise de remplacement, voici le discours de bienvenue prononcé lors de la séance de Campbellton.)

LAPIERRE:

Je vous souhaite tous la bienvenue à cette séance, puis au nom des membres de Conseil de l'environnement, c'est notre plaisir d'être ici d'écouter vos commentaires sur votre environnement.

I'll start by presenting the members of the Environmental Council who are here today as a part of a Panel to listen to your concerns and suggestions regarding the hazardous, general and controlled wastes for New Brunswick.

To my far right is Ken Langmaid. Ken Langmaid is a soil scientist, now retired and living in St. Andrews, New Brunswick. To my immediate right is Helen Taylor. Helen Taylor is a retired business lady from Doaktown. To my far left is Dave Kerr. Dave Kerr works for Fraser in Edmundston and to my immediate left is Don Smith. Don Smith is from Belledune. Myself, I'm Louis LaPierre. I'm a professor of ecology at the University of Moncton.

To just briefly introduce the topic. As you are no doubt aware, if you have read the literature that was forwarded before the meeting, you know that the Province of New Brunswick is undertaking a special review of the waste disposal practices in New Brunswick and wishes to try to implement a new or a safer waste disposal method for future years. This will entail three specific aspects.

The first one is related to domestic waste and as you have found in the literature you will see that we're looking at regional sites for domestic waste. These sites could be a number which might vary from 12 to 15 or so. These would be run under regional commissions and these would greatly reduce the present number of sites which are numbered over 250. So, there's quite a reduction.

The second aspect is the controlled waste aspect. As you know, we produce various types of waste, some of which are more dangerous than others and some of this waste has to be buried with precautions. Some of this controlled waste that we might classify as asbestos, for example, of which most New Brunswickers have heard in the last few months. The Province proposes a series of a limited number of these sites which would be strategically located throughout the Province depending on the ecological factors that would enable their establishment. These sites might be from three to seven where a more rigid control of waste management would be enforced.

The third type of waste that we have in New Brunswick is toxic or hazardous waste. At the present time, the plans are to have this waste shipped out of Province for disposal either by incineration or other means.

So these are the three main aspects of the waste control program and today we would like to hear your comments regarding these concerns. We have with us some people of the Department of the Environment who would be willing to answer questions and try to give you further information if you so desire.

I think we will follow the following procedures. Some people have indicated that they have formal presentations to bring forth. For those who have formal presentations I have a list of the individuals who have already identified themselves. And for those who do not have formal presentations, or who have yet not identified themselves, the only thing I would ask you to do is once these people have finished it to raise your hands and I will acknowledge as I notice the hands.

So, I would before we start the formal presentations, I'd like to announce that the Environmental Council is composed of 13 members. The Council is an advisory board to the Minister and today we are only five, you only see five members of Council. But, we are 13 members and we represent a cross section of society in New Brunswick.

I now call on the first speaker, Mr. Ken Frenette, of the Chaleur Regional Industrial Commission.

FRENETTE:

(Tape inaudible)....and that these were considered to be environmentally unacceptable. As a result of the perplexing nature of these reports we are no farther ahead. We still aren't sure how much toxic waste is being generated in the Province. We still are unsure how much is being improperly handled. Is it 80% of 1,481 tons or 80% of 46,885 tons. The protection of human health and healthy economy should be the major concerns regarding our actions vis à vis toxic wastes. We must move now toward reducing the dangers of toxic wastes in our environment. In order to achieve these aims, that is a healthy economy within a healthy environment, we make the following recommendations:

1. That an inventory and testing of various toxic materials be accelerated in old dump sites.

2. That a manifest system capable of readily identifying toxic wastes be put in place.

3. That additional legislation with clear guidelines be put in place and enforced.

4. That comprehensive information packages be available for both industry and public.

5. That government cooperate with industry in finding ways to both reduce the toxic wastes and improve treatment facilities.

6. That cost of government municipalities and industries be part of an evolution process and that the possibility of incentive legislation, low interest loans and user fees be examined in details.

Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you Mr. Frenette. I wonder if you may stay for a moment if we had a few questions to address to you...

FRENETTE:

Well like I said Mr. Chairman I'm just subbing for our president and I don't feel I'm an expert in this field but I'll do the best of my ability.

LAPIERRE:

I don't think that anyone is an expert here, I think we all face the facts. And I think as you so well stated in your report, the facts are that we do have wastes. It's a problem that society in general has to face up to, and I think that as we approach the 21st century, we can't hide from that problem. So I think in that light I would just like to ask a few questions and maybe we might be able to get a few answers to some of these questions that you brought up in your brief.

Number one is as you mentioned I guess, I would like to ask a question on the third recommendation in your report but as you stated, you may not be prepared to answer it in much more details that what is there. You were saying that additional legislation be introduced. Do you consider the present legislation to be inadequate or do we not have enough?

FRENETTE:

Probably the, maybe the Clean Environment Act which we have now in the Province is sufficient all right but I think that there should be additional inspectors probably to inspect some of these sites and no doubt there should be a maybe stronger legislation with some teeth to ensure that means will be taken to protect our air, water and soil.

And I might just mention or note here, Mr. Chairman, that we, The Chaleur Industrial Commission, find ourselves when we had this brief prepared, we were caught in a very delicate position because as a commission our objective is to promote the industry in the region and also at the same time, we are also concerned about the impact or the results that some of the industries are possibly able to create if they are established in some of our municipalities.

So, it was with ... we pondered the question before we prepared our brief and certainly we are not trying to come down hard on industry because, like I mentioned, it is our aim to promote the area regionally for economic.... and try to attract industries to the various municipalities.

LAPIERRE:

I understand from your brief, if I understand correctly, that you would agree to a user pay concept where the polluter pays concept...

FRENETTE:

Well, again, maybe like I said, we are trying to attract industries and maybe this would not be to popular with some of the industries who are trying to establish in the area. But I think there has come a time that if industries are going to establish and have products that they can distribute and sell, that maybe there should be some way that they should be asked to contribute to off-set the cost to maybe build some of these incinerators or in order to get rid of some of these toxic wastes. For instance, PCB's, which I understand the cost of these incinerators are quite excessive in dollars and cents.

LAPIERRE:

And I'll just maybe ask two more questions of you and then maybe we'll have some answers to one of your concerns in your report. One of them is, as Mr. Hill mentioned in his presentation, the Province is now looking, you mention PCB's. Incinerators are expensive. The alternative would be to send it elsewhere for destruction. What are your comments on the Province shipping to either Quebec or Ontario, their toxic wastes for destruction rather than in house or in Province?

FRENETTE:

Well I guess... are we... I believe that the Maritime Premiers had considered in 19... well quite a few years ago that they would probably would come up with an incinerator to provide this type of service or to dispose of PCB's for instance at a cost of $15 million. Now, since then very little has been heard about this and maybe because of due to cost this has been put on the back burner.

LAPIERRE:

The cost is a bit more than $15 million at the present time but anyhow, this is ... I understand but... You would have no objections to having the toxic wastes shipped out of Province as a citizen of New Brunswick, do you object to having it sent elsewhere or would you...

FRENETTE:

Well I believe the Province of Alberta, at the moment, will not accept or will not allow PCB's to be moved in a liquid form, it has to be solidified. So if the guidelines or the controls were stringent enough that they would ensure that certainly that there wouldn't be the problems that we hear about now a days or recently if measures were taken that the public were not endangered I certainly would not, I feel I wouldn't be against transporting out of the Province. But again it becomes a matter of cost I imagine also.

LAPIERRE:

One other question... There was, you've mentioned that we have to take care of some of our wastes as Mr. Hill mentioned again. We have what we call controlled wastes sites which are going to be established in the Province. Now if your county was selected as a target area, by that I mean it was displayed where these materials can be most safely stored in the Province, how would you as a citizen react to having one of these sites within your county area?

FRENETTE:

Are we talking...

LAPIERRE:

This is controlled wastes. Controlled waste is a waste that has to be controlled let's say one of these could be a waste oil, a truck spill along the highway and the gravel or dirt has to be put some place or asbestos for example...

FRENETTE:

Asbestos... Would that be a similar operation as in Renous?

LAPIERRE:

Well, this would be a site in which, similar to Renous, in which these products would be packaged and buried in a controlled way... similar to Renous I guess.

FRENETTE:

Well if the citizens of Renous were quite concerned, I imagine that we would get the same concerns in the Bathurst area. Certainly the reaction from the people of that area and what they were able to achieve when they found out that the Province had... the Department of Environment had proceeded to ensure them that the safety of the public was well taken care of by making use of these bunkers, they were sealed in cement and the asbestos was enclosed in bags and in drums. I'm sure that you would get the same reaction from people in this area. You know it's a very dangerous situation to be caught in and we also have the same elements here which we are trying to preserve, our water and our soil and certainly I think people would react in a similar manner as the people in Renous.

LAPIERRE:

OK. May I ask just another follow-up question. If this waste, controlled waste, was a result of industries in your area, would you be willing to safely dispose of it within your area? Would you be opposed to one of these sites if only wastes from your area was put into it?

FRENETTE:

Well I'm just speaking... my comments probably now are just as a citizen or an individual of the city. I'm not speaking on behalf of the Commission. As I said a while ago we're caught in the middle. We're trying to promote industry and we're having quite a problem bringing industry into the city, and certainly for us to say that if an industry comes in that there would be so stringent guidelines that they probably would not be interested to come into the Province or into our area or in our industrial parks or in the city to establish...

Like I said it's a delicate situation but I think that personally speaking as a citizen I would have the same concerns that were expressed by the people of the Miramichi. I think it's... the fear of these toxic wastes is something which a lot of people don't understand, but it's certainly, I think they are becoming more knowledgeable as the days go on. Every day you pick up the paper now that people are made aware of what PCB's are or what the problems that the people in the Fairvale area in Saint John encountered. The fear is there I mean especially in the outlying districts where we have well water, water provided through wells, deep wells and we have the same conditions that exist everywhere else in the Province, and the same concerns.

LAPIERRE:

But your brief states that these wastes are presently being trucked or disposed of in a regular landfill sites. Would you not feel safer to know that they're confined in a controlled site? They're not going to disappear...

FRENETTE:

I'm sure they would be. Oh yes. I would be in agreement if the proper area was found which met all conditions and it was properly managed, I'm sure the citizens ... people would certainly feel a lot more secure in knowing that this toxic waste is being handled in a very proper manner to be disposed of.

LAPIERRE:

OK, I thank you very much but I don't know if you would mind staying there for a minute. Maybe other members of Panel would have a question but first I would ask Mme Godin maybe. Could you care to comment... Mme Godin is from the ministry of the Environment and Municipal Affairs and maybe she could comment on the discrepancies in the figures that were presented in Mr. Frenette's brief regarding toxic wastes of the ... Is is 80% of 1,800 tons or is it 48,000 tons?

GODIN:

I don't think I'll address the percentage and the numbers as such. I was trying to explain the difficulties in establishing an inventory of hazardous wastes and the basic problem is in definition and difference of opinion between different jurisdiction. First of all the definition of what is and what is not a hazardous waste and then where do you apply the definition of a hazardous

waste? Do you apply it when the waste is generated, where you have most of your inventories of hazardous wastes that are generated in a Province? Well is that generated as they are generated in industry or if they're being treated by industry before they're released into the environment? Are they still considered to be hazardous wastes that are generated in the Province?

They do not reach the environment of the Province as a hazardous waste and the vast difference in numbers between the Environment Canada inventory and the Environment New Brunswick was exactly there and where you apply the definition and. It was the inclusion by Environment Canada of large volumes of what Environment New Brunswick consider to be industrial wastes which we consider to be treated wastes and did not fall into the category of hazardous wastes. Environment Canada's opinion was different from ours thus the difference in definition.

It's a difficult concept to understand if you're not working in the field and I sympathize with anybody looking at the different inventories and trying to understand the numbers. But that's essentially where the main difference lies. The definition of hazardous wastes is also extremely difficult to narrow down. The federal government, along with the Provinces, has been working on a definition of hazardous waste for the last five years in a formal working group, a federal-provincial industrial working group to get everybody's representation. And the definition of hazardous wastes which was arrived at was fairly similar to the definition of hazardous wastes which is used in the United States. And it is a very, very complex definition which includes two ways of defining a waste.

One is to define a hazardous waste because of its classification, because of its properties. If a waste has, meets certain criteria to make it corrosive, then it falls in the definition of a hazardous waste. The same for something that's flammable, the same for something that's toxic.

Apart from that, because the criteria is difficult to apply to some of the wastes because the wastes are very seldom pure products, you have a list of hazardous wastes. The list contains something over 3,000 products which, when they are wastes becomes hazardous wastes and it also contains I think 98 waste streams. And that defines a mixture of wastes which are produced by various industrial processes.

And the waste types are listed by the federal department of Environment and the department of Transport because the definition is under The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act and Regulations so that the definition of wastes or the number of wastes listed will probably vary, not vary but will increase with the years as we identify specific wastes types.

FRENETTE:

Are you saying that the criteria which the Province uses and applies in the... Environment Canada makes the use of are different?

GODIN:

In the case of ... the difference in the two inventories, it wasn't so much the criteria as the application of where do you apply the definition. Do you apply the definition when the waste is being released in the environment or when the waste is being generated by an industry. If an industry treats the waste in its process or treats the wastes on site...

FRENETTE:

As a by-product...

GODIN:

Then it's an industrial waste. It's controlled by the industrial waste section of the pollution control branch of Environment New Brunswick and it is addressed under those regulations and guidelines. It was not so much the criteria ... if a waste was an acidic waste or an alkaline waste and it was, I forget now, I think it was alkaline waste. At one point the waste is alkaline, both Environment New Brunswick and Environment Canada would agree that the waste is alkaline.

LAPIERRE:

Would you have a specific example of discrepancy between one and the other?

GODIN:

I believe that the discrepancy lies in the pulp and paper waste, industrial waste types but I'm not sure of that so I can't really narrow it down more than that.

LAPIERRE:

OK, so I guess what your answer is, you can see that there is a discrepancy and I guess that we're in the ball park of between 18,000 and 48,000 depending on what you're looking at but you have some idea. The question is we do have some and I guess regardless of the amount, we have to do something with it. I wonder if you have, if any members of the Panel would have any question for Mr. Frenette. Dave?

KERR:

I don't have a question for you. I certainly commend you and congratulate you on that brief you presented. Your Commission has certainly done their homework. There's no question of that at all. It's a well balanced brief and you made some very good points.

The Environmental Council has representatives of various areas. I represent C.M.A., the Canadian Manufactures Association, which is business and industry in this Province. I'd like to say that the days of a company and industry polluting the environment, grossly polluting the environment are gone. You mentioned that you would like to have your industrial commission obtain more industries in this region. Any industries that you've got here are not going to pollute your environment. Environmental protection, in March of 1986 is a cost of doing business and all of us look at it that way. It didn't use to be like that. Twenty years ago, it wasn't like that but today it is. And we know, any industry knows that you just can't do the things that were done 20 or 30 years ago. So I think you can be, I don't think you have to qualify your statements worrying about getting industries in and yet being too hard on them as to whether they're going to pollute the environment. The Province has laws, all the industry in New Brunswick has to abide by these laws and comply with the limits set by Environment New Brunswick on their effluents, on their emissions, and on their solid wastes.

LAPIERRE:

I just might ask one more question. I know you've been up for a while but if you'll be patient... one more question please. You mentioned a manifest system for transportation of I would think it would be transportation of hazardous wastes or wastes along the roadways. Would you want trucks than transports hazardous wastes to be specifically marked in which you as a citizen driving

behind one of these trucks would know that this truck is carrying a specific item and then you could either pull to the side of the road if you don't care to follow it or is this what you meant.

FRENETTE:

Well this new law that came in on transportation of dangerous wastes or material, isn't that part of the legislation..?.

LAPIERRE:

Yes, I was just wondering if you wanted more than what's there now because I was just going to say that there is a system in place now where you can identify on certain trucks. My question might be two parts, maybe you would want, you also speak of an education process. Would you want this to be much more widely publicize so that the general public would know what trucks or would you want more than what's being done?

FRENETTE:

Well I think if at all possible, if this could be done, certainly people would certainly appreciate and take advantage of say, if they are behind one of these transports and they notice that...indicated that there was a dangerous chemical being hauled, they probably would specially in heavy traffic or something because there has been a number of accidents where these transports have been involved in accidents in heavy heavy traffic. Certainly if I was driving behind one, probably I would let him go by... haul off on the side of the road and let him go by. But I think the manifest system, Mr. LaPierre, that we indicated too in our brief, it was not and not only on transportation of dangerous materials. It also applied to some sort of manifest system that would be say 100 tons of chemicals comes in to Consolidated Bathurst for instance just as an example, either as Varsol or some other chemicals we are, what we would like to see is that this would show where it has gone out in a by-product, if it was used in for instance in some other method of operation, where this chemical would eventually end up.

LAPIERRE:

From the cradle to the grave situation.

FRENETTE:

That's right. Not only have a dump down the ... probably down the sewers or... and that's pretty well the common, what's being done now that it probably ends up in our sanitary sewers in the city you know. I'm not pointing Consolidated Bathurst but the manifest system does not only apply to the transportation of dangerous goods. It would apply to the use of and control of chemicals in industry and to make sure that what goes in comes out.

LAPIERRE:

An accountability system.

FRENETTE:

Accountability more than anything else.

LAPIERRE:

OK, Thank you. Ken do you have a question?

LANGMAID:

What do you think about scheduling toxic wastes or hazardous wastes material going through roads and what time do you think it should go? At a time of low traffic period such as the middle of the night or... they take it off the road in the daytime in heavy traffic periods or... what do you think of that? And on special routes, specially in town ... specified routes for that stuff to travel on.

FRENETTE:

Well, certainly if it was possible at all, probably it would be, certainly it would be an advantage to the safety of everyone that they should be transported not at peak hours. If the alternate routes were available, through the cities, by-passing some of our major centers or any community, if it was at all possible, I think that's the way it should be transported. Because I know that there are, for instance the city of Bathurst here, I see these trucks going through right downtown Bathurst you know and what if one of these ever was involved in an accident or something.

I'm sure that instead of, whatever they're delivering, there should be other manner in which either through a system of transporting by smaller trucks into the industrial plant if it could be at all possible instead of the large transports coming right downtown for instance in Bathurst and going through the city and back on the by-pass, this would certainly be the way to handle the transportation of these materials ... chemicals.

LANGMAID:

Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Well I guess we'll ... You have a question?

TAYLOR:

I just have one comment. In your brief, you say regardless of the reasons behind the not in my backyard syndrome, it must be overcome. As a private citizen you gave your opinion that you probably wouldn't want it in your county as the Renous people. I wonder, could you add to that. How are we going to solve it then if you don't want it in your backyard...

FRENETTE:

Well maybe, not in my backyard, maybe I went a little, that's a little too stringent probably. Certainly if the area was... that could be located was in an isolated location, with the proper soil conditions, no streams or rivers that would be affected by any run-offs, certainly... There's only going to be six in the Province so eventually, you know, six of them are going to be placed in the Province somewhere. So one or two on the north-east side of the Province, it's something that we're going to have to accept somewhere because they have to be located and... But what I meant our backyards, I certainly, I wouldn't like to have one adjacent to the city of Bathurst or any other municipalities I believe in this area. If it was on Crown Lands somewhere 15 or 20 miles from any habitation, with the proper conditions probably, I would...

LANGMAID:

You specified a distance there and it's going to be hellish hard to find a place that is 15 or 20 miles from habitation. The specifications I believe for these things is 2 miles or 2 km of the nearest habitable building. That's a camp or anything. And it's... getting the right soil conditions, they're going to be very hard pressed to find 5 or 6 in the Province that will meet the conditions.

FRENETTE:

Yes I realize that. Anywhere in the Province where you're going to locate these, you're going to get criticism and you're going to get flack. There are throughout the Province, a series of roadways I suppose where people have established homes and camps and it's quite a difficult situation to find the proper location.

LANGMAID:

The other specific is a minimum of 17 feet or soil for the proper consistency. Seventeen feet of soil in this Province is hellish hard to come by especially onto clay.

LAPIERRE:

We would like to thank you for your brief and also for the kindness of answering our questions. I know we've kept you more than your time so we'll let you take your seat and please feel free to come back to address any topic that you might during the evening. And at this time, I guess we'll let you sit and may ask anyone else in this room who wishes to express...

Yes sir?

PLAYFAIR:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. This brief is submitted to the New Brunswick Environment Council on behalf of the Chaleur Firefighter's Association and the New Brunswick Association of Fire Chiefs and is just one of the very few probably that you will encounter in your trip around the Province to get various opinions on this particular topic.

The brief that I would like to, and it's a very short one, that I would like to express to you tonight is one in particular that deems the importance in regards to response personnel and in very particular firefighters. We would like to thank you for this opportunity to present our concerns regarding waste management from the provincial and regional organizations that affect firefighters from every region and inter-departmental procedures in the Province of New Brunswick. The brief comes to you in the form of our dearest interest and that is our own lives. And allow me to explain what I mean.

For years, the transportation, storage and handling of hazardous materials throughout this country is gone completely unchecked. Only until the last few years, including with the exception last July, was anything concrete and completed in respect to hazardous materials. Of course I'm giving you the date last July in respect to the federal government governing on the transportation of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes products.

The individual departments from around this Province and the Nation are being faced with disaster after disaster in regards to the man-made time bombs. Fire departments with little knowledge, skills, and ability in handling, handling such sometimes catastrophic situations only recently realized and understand the concept of hazardous materials and hazardous wastes.

They still do not possess the ability to control or to experience such foreign situations. Manpower, equipment, knowledge and ability in most cases cannot cope with your products of health. You come to us today to listen to an individual idea, complaints and concerns. And in doing so, you as a collective group must understand these things which I'm about to inform you of.

In our day and age of abominable wastes, man has created substances through which we have very little opinion in altering its contents and effects. Ultimately, the fire service in this Province ends up being the first line soldiers in control, defence and elimination of such incidents.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not prepared. We require more training, more equipment, more expertise and more time. The storage of hazardous wastes and materials becomes a prime concern to not only local fire departments but also regional and provincial ones. The increase and activities of these materials on our highways and by-ways, railways and airways must not happen at

least within the forseeable future. The effort coming from the provincial government is totally inadequate, both financially and morally. Fire departments in this Province need monies in order to direct their individual attention to more training, to more equipment and exposure to these happenings.

Fire departments in this Province need to know what travels through their own individual communities. Volunteer fire departments in this Province are scattered throughout our areas where response time could be of a life threatening magnitude.

Our lives, ladies and gentlemen, it's our lives. Remember if you can't handle it don't play with it. The simple transporting and storage of hazardous materials, in private homes and vehicles is not being regulated yet. And the placarding of private vehicles and homes seems to be one of only neglect in real action. Private homes discard, contain, store, a considerable large abundance of hazardous waste materials which presents multiplying problems at your simplest of structure fires.

It's our lives. The changing technology in the fire service today takes into consideration the hazardous materials and wastes. It provides a technique and basic information needed, the equipment has been manufactured and we require the financial assistance, and I repeat the financial assistance to strategically locate fire departments in this Province in order to obtain the equipment necessary to handle and also the financial assistance in order to train strategic personnel to at least be able to cope with such incidence.

The Bathurst Fire Department is the only fire department in the Province that has identified its wishes to form a hazmat team, now six men in order to serve our local citizens. Along with the EMO personnel, we hope to be able to try and control the hazardous materials incidence here and where else in this Province has anybody attempted to do the same?

Ladies and gentlemen, the first priority is the first line of defence and after all, it is our lives that are at stake. Some recommendations that I would bring to you tonight and have you consider and something on behalf on the fire service.

1. Set up strategic departments within the Province.

2. Financial aide to those individual fire departments.

3. To provide the particular equipment that it takes in order to handle these situations.

4. To train personnel in the proper techniques, handling and being able to identify the hazardous wastes products.

Then and only, long after transport and/or store has met in areas to popular, only popular to public scrutiny.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, hazardous waste management goes much further. It goes for waste, storage, usage, disposal and transportation. Appreciate one last thing: the untrained firefighter, under equipped, under experienced, being required to handle the most terrifying thing to man, hazardous materials and/or wastes.

Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. I wonder if you may, if you can stand to answer a few questions. I didn't get your name.

PLAYFAIR:

My name is Richard Playfair, Secretary to the New Brunswick Association of Fire Chiefs and President of the Chaleur Firefighters Association.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you Mr. Playfair. I wonder if you would care to comment on the present manifest system that we have for transportation of hazardous wastes.

PLAYFAIR:

The present system that we do have only gives firefighters in this Province a small chance to either identify what is being transported, to know where to identify, where to find out what is being transported. A manifest system in which identifying different hazardous materials throughout the roads of the Province only gives them an idea what they're working with, but it actually stops there. It may in fact give them how to treat it, they don't have the equipment to treat it well.

SMITH:

Are you saying that they don't know what it is or they can't treat it? I was under the impression that the system was an international system that was...

PLAYFAIR:

It is an international system, absolutely. They can identify the product, they can identify it if they've been properly trained. Don't forget that 75% of the firefighters in this Province are volunteers. It work at a total volunteer basis fire departments. OK? They can identify the product, and if they've been trained to know how to treat it, to know how to handle it, they do not have the equipment to do so with.

LAPIERRE:

Dave, did you have a question?

KERR:

No, I just wondered... We talked at one of the other meetings about these identification symbols, these diamonds on the trucks and I think you and Simone are the only ones in this building that know what they mean, because nobody else does. I think that's a very poor system myself.

PLAYFAIR:

Because it's in its infancy right now and we can appreciate that. Individual fire departments are trying very very hard to have, and I shouldn't maybe criticize the provincial government for doing absolutely nothing because it's not true. They are running hazardous material seminars which are informing emergency

personnel throughout the Province on the proper identification, the proper exposure to it not giving them any experience or knowing what to do and where to get those chemicals suits in order to do that with. The provincial EMO is trying about as hard as what they can but what we have to understand is that, we understand it's the same as everything else today, it's monetary. And it's something that has to be dealt with in the line of dollars and cents.

But I would express to you the importance of before we start to move it, before we start to decide where we're going to put it, let us decide on who the people are that are going to handle it in case it doesn't get where it's going to. Let's decide on how those people are going to be able to handle it, whether they're going to be properly trained and equipped in order to handle it to protect the citizens in which it might be travelling from community to community. In which so many people in the Province are not going to want to have it in their backyard.
... travel. And if we accept to have it travel, are we accepting to have it travel inter-provincially. If we may become the dumping site of Canada or eastern Canada, that becomes a very big concern for every fire department around. And not only fire departments merely, I might even express the Police department because some of those situations that you may run into in the placarding on different vehicles in which they may be involved in automotive accidents. It can be very very terrifying. Before anything is even brought to rest or even started to commence to control it, how many people will lose their lives and accidentally?

LANGMAID:

Can you give us some idea in the cost saved for your unit here, you're talking six man unit, the minimum and the maximum, ball park figure so that we have some kind of an idea.

PLAYFAIR:

I'm sorry at the present time I can't do that Ken. I would really like to do that because we're very concerned about it, we are very enthused that we have taken that route. I couldn't mention any figures to you but I would like to mention to you that we have some of the equipment that is available and has been made available through our own department, through the good wishes of our own chief that gives us the foresight to go on and to be able to handle those situations.

One of the few departments in the Province that might even have enough would we say it's got... stand up and look at some of that stuff and would it even be the courage of firefighters to say that they're willing to deal with it? In the Province we haven't had any but this city. This city is determined that they would like to set one up and probably will go through with it in the very near future. But financial aid is something that is very very important. It's not there right now.

LANGMAID:

Maybe you should get Lady Beaverbrook to donate one to St. Andrews, Mr. Playfair. She's done everything else.

No, the other thing was how many of these units would you think in the Province would be required? You say strategically placed type of thing...

PLAYFAIR:

I would only throw as a suggestion out to the Council, you take a look at your permanent status firefighters, the areas in which these permanent status firefighters are employed, you need personnel out of there 24 hours a day in order to be able to jump on the incident and be able either control it, cope with it, warn other people from it. I guess basically, what I'm talking about is take a look at your cities. They're very strategically placed throughout the Province, they have a manpower situation of permanent firefighters and volunteer combination. They give you a good cross section of this Province of your highways and by-ways that completely circle and encompass the Province itself. And I think it will probably give you a bare minimum protection that you would probably need.

SMITH:

The comment that Mr. Kerr made about only two of you knowing about this system. At our last meeting, when the public learned of it they wanted to know why it wasn't known to everybody. I believe it was Mrs. Godin who answered. The impression was that they are putting all their efforts toward you. Is this a fair statement?

PLAYFAIR:

I believe, yes, I guess I could say that it would be a relatively fair statement. Fire departments have been probably the only people that can pick up the Hazmat quick response or emergency response guide and be able to read it like a telephone book. The amount of chemicals that we have today floating and flying and rolling around our highways and by-ways in the whole nation, and it doesn't exclude this country at all so, includes the United States is just mind boggling. In order to keep that emergency response guide up to snuff, it is a tremendous task. And if you take a look at it, it is like reading a phone book so you can go through your multiples of chemicals, so the ordinary average everyday person would probably not encounter it. He would probably look for propane, he would probably look for flammable liquids that might be transported and placarded on the trucks. They might be able to identify with those but some of the hair raising ones, I would hardly thing that they would.

SMITH:

Our previous speaker mentioned that he would pull off to the side of the road, with the system of those little diamond cards that are now in existence. How long do you figure it would take them to get from here to Saint John, with all the vehicles that are on the road?

PLAYFAIR:

Well I would think that... I don't know what Mr. Frenette would deem necessary to pull over for but...

SMITH:

But they're all, for him they're all the same. He can't tell what they are.

PLAYFAIR:

OK. I don't know, I ... Because I know of them I'd pull over for propane. I'd let that go. I know what it looks like and I know what it's like. I think some people are... I don't think we can treat the public as being so uneducated that they can't identified what is in the particular type of vehicles that is carrying it but I would say, I know what your question is. They are so many on the highways now, that how long would it take a person to get to Saint John... designated routes, certain times of day. You have volunteer fire departments, do not forget ladies and gentlemen, in the daytime the response time for the volunteer... is bad because of unemployment. People need jobs and they work at their jobs in the daytime.

But also on the other hand, if you had designated routes and those routes are set up in the wee hours of the morning, then you have to start working with your adverse conditions. You have to work with your sleep, your snow, your rain. You have to work with your fog, you have to work with all different types of things that you might be able to cope with in the daytime. So there's good points and bad points but obviously designated routes would certainly, I know, make the citizens of Bathurst feel much better if they were going around our city rather than through, that's bad.

LAPIERRE:

Mr. Playfair, maybe, one question... somewhat maybe not related to the last comments that you made but as a citizen of New Brunswick. I wonder if you would care to comment on the idea of a regional controlled waste sites? As they were explained...

PLAYFAIR:

OK, and I have to stick to my presentation because I really believe in it. I would be in agreement to regional disposable sites that were stringently controlled to a provincial guidance with the unacceptability of any other waste products or hazardous materials products coming from any other country or state or Province, and I would agree with it only whenever the fire service in this Province can adequately handle the transporting of those wastes materials around the Province to those regional areas.

I would think that after you have something to put into play before you put that into play and that is to make those people that are going to be able to put that on, that tipped tanker back up on its wheels without killing thousands of people. There are priorities and priorities start with the emergency personnel to be able to be knowledgeable enough to handle the situation and then to be able to govern it and run it into your regional areas. And only then would I be in agreement to regional areas. Only then would I be in agreement to regional areas.

LAPIERRE:

OK, I wonder one more question... You mentioned often in your presentation, items of cost. I wonder what your opinion is on a user pay concept? For example, when you go out to a tanker truck that is spilled, I'm just using this as an example, maybe one of Irving or whatever it may be, do you charge the company for going out and picking up the chemicals or...

PLAYFAIR:

At the present time?

LAPIERRE:

Yes.

PLAYFAIR:

No we do not.

LAPIERRE:

Do you think you should?

PLAYFAIR:

I have a little different opinion that what maybe some people from industry do. It's my life and it's my friend's life that is at stake whenever the tanker is overturned. And if the least I could do is charge him and make him pay for what he's done, I would be in agreement to that. Because I think that whatever happens on the road has to be governed, has to be looked after and has to be controlled. When a mishap does occur, somebody obviously has to pay for it.

At the present time, I believe the individual companies are paying for their own clean-up. I may be wrong on that but I know that the municipalities are not paying for it at the present time.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you. Miss Godin, could you comment on who pays at the present time? If a truck spills by the, within the city for example and the firefighters respond to it, do you get a bill from the firefighters?

GODIN:

Hopefully it's the trucker's insurance company that would pay for it. That's what it should be or the trucker himself if he's not heavily insured. But that is the policy.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you.

PLAYFAIR:

Thank you very much.

LAPIERRE.

Thank you very much Mr. Playfair. Yes I have a ... go ahead sir.

ASSAFF:

Members of the Council, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is George Assaff. I'm director of Public Works for the City of Bathurst and I'm here tonight to present a brief on behalf of the City of Bathurst.

Can you hear me all right?

LAPIERRE:

Yes sir.

ASSAFF:

The City of Bathurst is very pleased to have this opportunity to present its concerns regarding waste management at the local level and to provide input into the development of the Province's waste management policy, and in particular, with the development of New Brunswick's long-term hazardous waste management program. The city has a very special interest in these matters. Not only because we are in the business of waste management at the local level, but also because we too are very concerned about our environment and our health and about the lack of adequate and effective means for the handling and the final disposal of these hazardous waste products. We are very fortunate in this part of the Province to be blessed with so many rivers and beaches. We are very familiar with the damage that can be caused to these resources by uncontrolled waste disposal. The death of Little River and the contamination of shellfish in the Bathurst Harbour are but two examples.

We also have a special interest in protecting our public water supply from damage caused by pollution. Our Carter's Brook and Middle River Watershed areas are very extensive and for the most part lie beyond the limits of our municipal jurisdiction. The City and Province have injected large investments in providing this valuable water supply system for this area and every effort must be taken to protect this most important resource.

The City is well aware of its responsibility for protecting the environment and providing a proper waste management program for its citizens. Recently we have completed the multi million dollar construction of a waste water collection and treatment system for the city. Also the city operates and manages a sanitary landfill for the disposal of domestic waste products. The operation and maintenance of these facilities represents a major cost to the citizens of Bathurst and attests to the city's serious commitment for providing a clean environment for its residents to live in.

However, we too are plagued with waste related disposal problems. The disposal of sewage sludge generated at our municipal waste water treatment plant has been a serious problem we have been faced with since the start up of our plant in 1983. Strong emphasis has been placed on clean waste water treatment effluents and clean receiving streams with little regards of the problem of what to do with the large quantities of sludge produced. Pathogenic organisms and toxic chemicals concentrated in the sludge carry a risk of environmental degradation. Presently, sewage sludges are being disposed of at the municipal landfill but this practice has proven to be not acceptable. The high water table which is characteristic of the disposal site, make it very difficult to bury the sludge and, left uncovered, it creates a serious odor problem and health hazard to the employees and users of the dump.

The threat of contamination of the water table and nearby wells is also a serious concern. We are very interested in finding alternative means for the proper disposal of sludges. Incineration and land application are some of the alternatives being practiced in other parts of the country, but has yet to be explored widely in New Brunswick. It is beyond the resources and expertise of this municipality to tap into this technology alone. We are well aware that other municipalities in this Province are faced with this problem and we expect it to grow as more communities develop their own ways to water treatment facilities.

Also included in this problem is the disposal of septic tank sludges which has already become a common concern throughout the Province. We feel that the Province should take the leadership and provide a system to municipalities who are faced with these problems. In the end, the expertise developed will be a benefit to the Province as a whole.

Another problem area that we are concerned with is related to disposal of special wastes. The city operates a sanitary landfill which is for the exclusive use of its residents. By by-law, the disposal area is regulated, and excludes the disposal of controlled and hazardous wastes. However, we are aware that some special wastes products are being disposed of at the landfill site. These include hospital wastes, dry cleaning fluids, petroleum products and household wastes such as paints, solvents, pesticides and cleaners.

We are concerned about this practice but tolerate it at the present time until a more favourable solution can be found. We are very concerned about special waste products that may be entering our landfill without our knowledge. Local, industrial, commercial and institutional firms also dispose of their wastes at the municipal site and we have no control of what may be mixed with their loads. Quite often, the hauler is unaware of the full contents of the wastes that is being disposed of. It is beyond our means to dig through the loads to identify which products are hazardous.

It is our experience that neither the public nor the employees involved in waste disposal are knowledgable in what constitutes a hazardous waste or how to dispose of these products safely. Increasing public awareness to education and advertising campaign as well as introducing programs for officials and employees involved in waste management would be an effective starting point of addressing the problem. However, such programs would prove to be worthless if adequate collection and disposal facilities were not available.

Recently, the public has become more aware of the dangers of hazardous wastes through the media reporting of such instances as the spill of PCB's in the Province of Ontario last year and more recently with the pollution of wells in the Fairvale area with perchloroethylene. However, very little attention is ever given to the potential dangers of household hazardous wastes. Such wastes include paints, solvents, pesticides, cleaners, ... acids and home chemistry sets which are stored in home garages, tossed in trash cans, buried in landfills or backyards or poured down drains.

The consequences of such actions, seemingly minute, pose the greatest threat to our water supply. Pioneer effort in the United States in the early 1980's have led to the successful establishment of special collection programs for household hazardous wastes. Such programs provide for the periodic collection of small quantities of hazardous wastes from household government agencies, small business and schools, and the transportation of these products to hazardous waste management facilities.

There is no reason why such a service could not be provided in New Brunswick through a joint provincial municipal effort. On a larger scale, tougher federal and provincial legislation is required to control and regulate the production and use of chemicals and biological substances that may present an unreasonable risk of injury to health and environment.

The dumping of toxic wastes in sewer lines, rivers and the atmosphere should be banned. Increased enforcement and stricter penalties for non compliance is urgently needed. The ultimate goal for the management of hazardous wastes should be zero discharge. Treatment and recovery should be given preference with secure land burial as a last resort. Numerous techniques for the management of hazardous wastes have been in use and proposed but all have their limitations. Because of the treatment and disposal complexities and the social, economic and environmental factors involved, regional processing centres could be advantageous to both industry and public to help assure, convenient and proper disposal of hazardous wastes.

As with most air, water, solid wastes and other pollution control activities, certain general and basic principles could also be applied. As appropriate to hazardous wastes, persistent long-lit chemicals may best be destroyed in special incinerators at controlled temperature. The Province, in conjunction with proper expertise, should and will be the final judge in determining what measures should be taken to ensure the safe and final disposal of these special wastes products.

Geographically, legal jurisdictions rarely coincide with an environmental problem and since environmental systems can never be closed from the rest of the world, a local problem typically affects far beyond local boundaries. Therefore, a successful and effective waste management program must include efforts to persuade various parties within a region to cooperate and coordinate activities.

A regional approach to these wastes management issues on hazardous wastes similar to the recent establishment of regional solid waste commissions would go a long way in initiating a comprehensive waste management program. However, such a group should be expanded to include not only municipal and provincial agencies but also representatives from the industrial, commercial and institutional sectors.

A broader approach such as this could promote and increase awareness of chemical hazards and assist communities in preventing potential problems rather than responding to them.

On a final note, we wish to present our concerns of the needs for increased awareness of public and private officials regarding the roles and responsibilities when emergencies occur. Recent incidents of spills and leaks of hazardous chemicals have resulted in public officials asking themselves, "where do we fit in."

This concerns exist because of the distinctive multi-disciplinary responsibilities in handling emergency situations. Any waste management policy or program must also include a formalized, integrated emergency response system.

Ultimately, the challenge is ours and our successes and failures will be our legacy to our children in future generations to come. Thank you.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much. I wonder if you might also consent to answer a few questions.

ASSAFF:

I'll try.

LAPIERRE:

I'll just start off and maybe other members of the Panel would care to join in after. I would just like to hear your comments on the user pay concept. All these systems which your brief expands upon, are all, I guess, fall in line with what the Province is considering. However, pollution or waste is generated by people, and as you mentioned it in your brief, we have a responsibility to collectively take care of it. Do you consider it to be a user-pay concept?

ASSAFF:

Well it is my opinion that presently municipalities operate municipal landfills and therefore the cost of handling their domestic wastes is really a user-pay system in that the taxpayers are paying for the operation of the landfill. Personally, I believe that a user-pay system is one option that could be used. I think that on a municipal level, the municipality could involve themselves through a same type of system in handling their own type of waste. I think on a larger scale, yes I believe that

larger sources of hazardous wastes, the disposal should definitely be the cost of the source. Yes I would agree in the user fee.

LAPIERRE:

I seem to gather from your brief that you're also in support of a regional controlled site where proper disposal would be made of many chemicals that you mentioned in your brief. Supposing, and this is a question that you as an individual, I'm asking it to you as a citizen of this county, supposing that this was one of the areas in which a regional landfill or a controlled waste site was located, how would you react to that?

ASSAFF:

As a private citizen, I have no problem with a properly established hazardous wastes facility on a small scale. I don't think I would be interested in handling large quantities of industrial hazardous wastes in this area.

LAPIERRE:

My question was more on controlled wastes. Hazardous waste, I think the situation would be to have hazardous wastes sent out for proper incineration but say controlled wastes. From what I, if I gather correctly from what you said, is it if the waste was generated in your area, you would be willing to take care of it in your area if the site was located...

ASSAFF:

If I could be assured that a properly established facility could be had, I would have no problems with it. But I'd like to add that I think we have a credibility Province here in the Province of New Brunswick. As I'm experienced in the operation and maintenance of landfills and other areas, I feel that we have not developed credibility with the public and with ourselves in how we've handled these waste management situations in the past. And I think we have quite a job in insuring the public that we can manage this type of waste properly and that if we can assure ourselves and the public that yes we can do it properly, I don't think there would be any problems.

LAPIERRE:

Even if it came from another part of the Province? For example if it was asbestos from Saint John...

ASSAFF:

I think we're talking beyond the region now aren't we?

LAPIERRE:

Yes I know but would you react the same way if it was beyond the Province. If we're only going to have six or seven sites in the Province, some place, somewhere, someone is going to get someone else's wastes.

ASSAFF:

Personally again, I have no problems with a site that is properly developed, and the controls are ahead of it. Personally I'd have no problem with, it as long as it was situated in the proper location.

LAPIERRE:

OK. Does anyone else have any questions? Go ahead Don.

SMITH:

Concentrating on more or less the same thing as far as treatment of wastes and the user pay. We never talked about who pays for the collection. In other words if we reduce the number of sites as drastically as we're talking about, and there's been no reference this evening to collection on a universal basis and a lot of places do not have collection, so how do you feel about the potential there for more general funding on collection and therefore avoiding more ... ten times as much stuff along the side of the road?

ASSAFF:

Well, looking at it at a preliminary level, I think that a municipality say the size of Bathurst could not afford to provide for a collection service for these types of products. But I do believe that a regional approach to it, or provincial approach to it, that it could be feasible.

There are several ways this could be adopted and it has been done in the various parts of the United States. And I've recently learned that British Columbia has had this system going now since 1978 I believe. And it involves periodic collections during the year to households or at a specific location where residents can or small firms can deposit their wastes at we would consider a controlled or hazardous wastes. These could be either collected in a special vehicle and transported somewhere. This could be a central storage location in the Province or it could be a regional storage. I think one provincial storage place is not a bad idea.

A community really would only require perhaps two periodical collections a year, one in the spring and one in the fall and one or two trucks equipped with the proper professionals circulating in the Province during the year could cover quite a few municipalities and I believe the cost then would be minimized and could probably be within the means of the Province and the municipalities.

SMITH:

In the domestic wastes?

ASSAFF:

I don't know what you mean?

SMITH:

Well the collection of domestic wastes is not universal in New Brunswick.

ASSAFF:

No it isn't but...

SMITH:

There are several hundred dumps, therefore people must be quite close to a dump somewhere and there's still a lot of stuff on the side of the road.

ASSAFF:

Yes, well I think there would have to be strategic ...

SMITH:

Just going back to the user-pay idea, how do you feel about the overall, both sides of the coin?

ASSAFF:

Well, like I said, I believe the taxation system more or less ensures that the user pays.

LAPIERRE:

Well, I guess... At this time I guess we would thank you for your brief and we welcome the comments in your brief. It certainly will help us in the preparation of our report. So, if you have any other questions, please feel free to call upon us.

Yes sir.

P. CORMIER:

Good evening, my name is Percy Cormier. I live where the city dump is located and where the county dump is located. The city dump is controlled by the City of Bathurst. They try to do a good job. They bury the garbage. This is just like putting a band aid on your finger. Eventually, that's going to come up and ruin our Bass River, brooks that are flowing into the Bass River, eventually in our Bay. The Rough Waters Dump is located not too far from the Nepisiguit River, it's another affair that is really a terrible affair.

In Allardville, another dump... In Janesville, another dump. We got them all over. Very little control except the City of Bathurst. They control it fairly well. But it's no way, it's a long, long time ago we did this kind of stuff, burying our garbage. Now, the only thing if the Province is thinking about doing something about a garbage is to build a half a dozen incinerators throughout the Province and have this stuff carted there. Let the Province of New Brunswick take over the collection of the garbage throughout the whole Province. They don't spend money by the millions, they spend it by the billions. So why not take and make a good job and be rid of this.

The controlled dumps will never be controlled that they won't come up in the future. Our children and our children's children will have to suffer with these dumps. And besides that, look at the lovely parcels of land that's going to be required in the future and the lovely parcels of land that are occupied now that will never for years and years be of any use to anybody when land is getting scarce. All the time, land is getting scarcer. I've said I was located near dumps. These are the gentlemen that said they didn't want them in their back yards? I'm about to get one in my front yard.

We're located on the east side of the Nepisiguit River. We live on the road going down to the dump. Consolidated Bathurst are at present considering very much of locating a lagoon in my front yard. This is terrible. We just will have to move unless it's very well controlled. After that, the stuff is going to run into Nepisiguit River. They said it's going to be purified and so forth. They're going to put a lovely building over it and so forth but I have pictures here from engineers and so forth. There's no successful dump up until now in Canada or I don't believe in the States but they're a little better that what we have at present.

It was Mr. Kerr that said that the residues of the companies is a business expense. But I would say that residues of the people of New Brunswick is a business expense for the Province of New Brunswick and it should be looked after.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much sir. I wonder if you could stay there for a question or two? Do I gather from your comments that you would be in favor of incinerators versus landfills?

P. CORMIER:

Definitely, I would be in favor of incinerators.

LAPIERRE:

And you would be in favor of having these located in strategic places throughout the Provinces and the wastes...

P. CORMIER:

Yes, not too close to residents

LAPIERRE:

Not too close to residents. And wastes being transported to these areas and incinerated.

P. CORMIER:

That's right. And it would be a responsibility of our Province. They would just tax everybody in the Province for it. That's it.

LAPIERRE:

Do you have any questions for Mr. Cormier?

SMITH:

That was my next question when I had an opportunity, was about incinerators. It was brought up to me earlier today and it was also mentioned that the, I believe the first speaker referred to oil spills and clean up. In fact the question was that came to me was maybe Mrs. Godin can answer to me but, hundred truck loads of gravel that is saturated with oil, should it not be put through an incinerator if this gentleman has one built rather than stored way the heck out in the wilderness where it will eventually get somewhere. That was a question I was presented with early today.

P. CORMIER:

Everything should go out through the incinerators, everything.

LANGMAID:

You say the Province should pay for that, why not the user. If you put in a hundred tons and I put in one, why should I subsidize you for the other 99 tons when I should pay for my one?

P. CORMIER:

Well, you're creating employment if you're doing that and I'm not creating very much. The person that is creating the employment is handling out the money. He's going to have a bigger assessment on his buildings and so forth. Eventually, it will even up. It's impossible to get everything just.

LAPIERRE:

Sir, I wonder if I may ask another question? Your incinerator might be good for a certain quantity of wastes that we have. However, there are other wastes that we may not be able to dispose of.

P. CORMIER:

Like bottles and cans?

LAPIERRE:

Well I guess bottles and cans might be... You would recycle those would you?

P. CORMIER:

That's right, recycle.

LAPIERRE:

What about specific chemicals for example in which you would need, you know, a high temperature incinerators. These are extremely costly and may not fall into the price of general...

P. CORMIER:

They should look to the future to have one located in the Province.

LAPIERRE:

You would consider having one in the Province rather than sending the chemicals outside of the Province?

P. CORMIER:

I think so yes. The other Provinces are going to soon pass laws that they don't want our wastes.

LAPIERRE:

Any other comments? Thanks a lot sir. Yes Gerry?

HILL:

I just thought I might make one slight comment about incineration. It's one treatment option if you'd like for disposing of wastes. Nevertheless, there are, how should I put it, there are certain kind of wastes that you need to burn at an extremely high temperatures in order to effectively destroy them. In other words, if you have a large load of wastes going to an incinerator, and they're burned there, the average citizen, you and I going by will say well gee, you know, the truck load went in there and they burned it all and there's just this little bit of ash left over so we don't have to worry about it anymore.

But we should not forget the whole question of air pollution OK? And there may be, in fact there are, many kinds of waste products that if you put them into an incinerator system, you will destroy or get rid of what the average citizen like you and me would see as the waste. But in the process of doing that, you're going to turn certain chemical products that are inherent in that waste material into gases and other kinds of atmosphere emissions which may be environmentally dangerous as well. So just because the material is burned, doesn't necessarily mean it's destroyed.

To give you an example, in the documents that are before you, that are being distributed, there's mention made of PCB's. Everyone knows that PCB's are a very difficult environmental problem to deal with. One of the reasons that they are so difficult to deal with is that it's very very hard to destroy them and the incinerators that are required to destroy PCB's have to be pieces of equipment that can burn these materials at 3000° C. In other words, unless you get up to that temperature, you may risk air pollution which will have certain chemical products in it, which were not totally destroyed in the burning process. So although, while I want to say that from the point of view of our department, incineration is in some instances, a very valid option in regard to treatment of wastes, we have to remember that incineration has to take place in a very controlled manner so as to ensure that you don't replace a solid waste problem with an air pollution problem.

Exactly, exactly... And in the case of PCB's, during the meeting of ministers of the Environment which took place in Montreal last June, this was subsequent to the Kenora PCB incident, it was recognized that in Canada at this present time there simply does not exist a facility in Canada that has the technical capability of destroying PCB's. We do not have in Canada at the moment one of these high temperature incinerators. The government of Quebec announced at that time that they have plans to establish one of these incinerators and it's not completely clear when that facility would be available. Nevertheless, the estimated cost for the development of that incinerator which burns at 3000° C is in the area of $35 to $60 Million to build the machine.

So that's one of the reasons why with regards to hazardous wastes now, we're not talking about controlled wastes but hazardous wastes, why the Province is saying that in New Brunswick the sophisticated technology that's required to destroy hazardous wastes such as PCB's is unlikely to be developed in New Brunswick. It's much more likely to be developed in the more heavily industrialized parts of the country. Hence, as far as PCB's are concerned as an example, our only option at the moment is storage. We must stored this material until such time as a high temperature incinerator is available.

SMITH:

There's very few other things that require the 3000°?

HILL:

I wish I was a technical expert to be able to answer that. Simone Godin is in a better situation ...

SMITH:

Would that be 5% of that category or 50%?

HILL:

My general impression is that the kinds of incinerators they're talking about developing in Quebec which would be capable of totally destroying PCB's would also be capable of destroying some other hazardous wastes.

SMITH:

But no, what I'm saying is how many other things would require that special kind of furnace in a ... Would PCB's make up 50% of their weight or 5%

HILL:

Simone?

GODIN:

PCB's would at first be a high percentage of their weights but with time would become non-existent because PCB's are not being produced. They're being removed from service as equipment is taken out of service and as soon as we get some place in the country where we have a facility capable of destroying PCB's, the PCB problem is going to be slowly disappearing. The incinerators capable of incinerating PCB's can also incinerate all other types of wastes which can be destroyed through incineration. The chlorinated solvents which are especially difficult to incinerate would be handled by a PCB incinerator. The extra technical particularities of a PCB incinerator makes it more expensive to get that incinerator together to be capable to handle the PCB's. But it's a super incinerator which will have extra capacity but that will handle more common hazardous wastes.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you Mme Godin. I would just like to know how many more people would like to present... Yes, OK. I have two people who have asked to present. Normally, we take a short break. We have some coffee and donuts outside so I wonder we would be sitting here for maybe an hour an half if we take a short break and come back. But we have two people who would like to formally present and then if there are other people that would like to say something, please feel free.

And also, there are a couple of topics that haven't been addressed at all. For example, we just briefly mentioned recycling. We seem to think that all our wastes needs to be buried or burned but is there nothing else that we can do to recycle it? We are a wasteful society. Maybe we should look at alternatives.

There's also, we mentioned incineration, it's not mentioned in the provincial plan for New Brunswick but, Charlottetown has put together an incineration project that might be interesting in which the city is now burning the wastes for heating the hospital and the airport. So there is a by-product recovery. Maybe we should look at these aspects, maybe some of you have comments on this when we come back so if you want, we'll take a short break and we'll come back in 15 minutes please.

LAPIERRE:

Deuxième section. Il y avait deux individus qui avaient demandé la parole avant de partir, avant qu'on se sépare. Donc, je vois qu'il y a un des messieurs qui est maintenant au micro puis on vous laisse la parole.

CHAMBERLAIN:

My name is Alfred Chamberlain. I see you've got a task force on environmental control in the Province of New Brunswick. I'm very glad to see you here. I hope that is not a band aid like Mr. Cormier said a few minutes ago. It is something that will, to work towards the benefit of this Province and the benefit of the public. We have problems in our own city, under pollution controls. We would just like to know like it says here, Environment New Brunswick. It's very nice to have, but are we serious of having you people come up here and looking for briefs to see where we stand on the health effects of the public? And yet we go... and I just wonder if the Government is serious when they have, we have city policemen in the city, we have RCMP, we have Highway Patrols. We all know that they were asked to make you follow the speed limits. How about our inspectors? Are they really serious of the job?

LAPIERRE:

OK, I guess your question could be answered in two parts. If we weren't serious, and if we weren't preoccupied and concerned with the questions that we have before us, I don't think that we would be here tonight because we are not government employees. I drove from Moncton this afternoon, I worked till 2:30, I drove up here, I'm driving back after the meeting tonight because I have to be to work early tomorrow morning. So I wouldn't do that, drive throughout the Province if I wasn't preoccupied with the environment of New Brunswick.

I think we are quite concerned with the environment of New Brunswick and we share, as you do, a concern for a continued safe environment in New Brunswick. So I guess you can, as far as I'm concerned - I'm sure the other members of the Panel, we can be assured that we will do our best to put forward recommendations that represent the opinions of people like yourself throughout the Province in our brief.

For the second question, I'd ask maybe Mr. Monti or Mlle Godin as far as the inspectors are concerned. Maybe just a brief account of where they are and what they do.

GODIN:

OK, there are seven environmental inspectors to cover the Province of New Brunswick. There's a head inspector, and six regional inspectors. They're in Bathurst, Grand Falls, Fredericton, Saint John, Moncton and Chatham. The inspectors are responsible for a wide variety of environmental inspections and controls and they have... they're in the front line where we're in the head office in Fredericton. They meet the people who have problems. And one thing that I think that happens quite often is that the inspectors report back to Fredericton, to the people who are responsible for the various areas where the problems arise.

And the inspectors can only do so much. They can't solve a lot of the problems that are brought to their attention because it is beyond the scope of their mandate and their ability. And I've dealt with the inspectors across the Province on all kinds of problems and they are dedicated individuals and they care about what they do. What is difficult is that the Department of the Environment cannot always find a solution to a problem as quickly as people would want us and as quickly as we would want to find a solution. And that's very frustrating for the people who are aware of the problem, who bring it to the attention of the department, usually through the inspector and when the problem doesn't get resolved, I think the inspector gets blamed and it's not his fault.

LAPIERRE:

Well sir, does that answer you question or do you have...

CHAMBERLAIN:

No I don't think that answers my question because I feel that if I was an inspector, doing a job in the Province and not just in Bathurst, in the Province, and my job was to police the environment and I have people in Fredericton who are my superiors, now if these superiors in Fredericton are not prepared to handle the situation, maybe they should be the ones that come out and take the inspectors job and take the inspectors and put him in their place in Fredericton, or maybe into the inter-cabinet as well. Because there is a problem and I think that there's no use just wheeling around it, it's either we do it or we don't.

LAPIERRE:

Well thank you sir.

TAYLOR:

Would you be more specific about what you are talking about?

CHAMBERLAIN:

The whole city of Bathurst, for example, and some pollution that we have in the city. I don't like to come out here and see why the pollution are, but the department knows what they are.

TAYLOR:

And you feel they're not being handled...

CHAMBERLAIN:

I don't think so, no.

LANGMAID:

Have you reported these directly to Fredericton or something like that?

CHAMBERLAIN:

Like I said, if I give it, what happen to me, what I did, I be coming in public and tell you exactly from where the problems are. I think inspector know where the problems are. If you want to lets people know later on, he can do that.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you sir. There was a... il y avait un autre commentaire.

F. CORMIER:

Bonsoir messieurs, dames... merci. Je ne représente pas aucun groupe mais autant que citoyen de la région et un adepte du plein air, j'suis quand même assez concerné par la pollution qu'on vit avec un peu partout dans nos villes puis aussi dans nos bois aux environs.

D'abord concernant le sujet de nouveaux sites de dépotoirs régionaux un peu plus modernes et plus efficaces que qu'est-ce qu'on avait dans le passé soit nos dépotoirs à ciel ouvert qui étaient quand même une honte pour tous ceux qui devaient s'en servir. Ce n'est peut-être pas la solution idéale mais c'est quand même un pas dans la bonne direction puis je tiens quand même à féliciter les gens qui ont décidé de prendre une décision là-dessus.

Vous aviez mentionné tantôt le transport de déchets toxiques puis il y a deux choses. Je n'ai pas les solutions à savoir qu'est-ce qui est mieux - l'incinération ou l'entreposage mais s'il doit y avoir entreposage je pense qu'il y a deux points qui devraient peut-être être considérés dans le transport. Une des choses, vous ne pouvez peut-être pas faire les mêmes affaires que le Ministère des Transports peut peut-être faire lorsqu'il fait des constructions, de le faire en plein milieu de la saison touristique où les routes sont très achalandées. Donc surveiller les périodes de temps où est-ce que la circulation est beaucoup plus dense et d'éviter le transport de déchets toxiques à ces moments-là.

Et aussi en deuxième temps, ce serait les périodes estivales où est-ce que les routes, pas estivales mais hivernales je devrais dire, où est-ce que les routes sont glacées et dangereuses, peut-être d'éviter que les camions transportant des déchets toxiques soient sur les routes à ce moment-là, OK, pour essayez de minimiser autant que possible les risques d'accidents.

Un troisième point que j'aimerais toucher et qui n'a pas été mentionné aujourd'hui... Je pense qu'il y a beaucoup de, on parle de déchets toxiques. Mais le déchets c'est la dernière, l'entreposage ou l'élimination de déchets, c'est la dernière à quoi on parle. Peut-être qu'on a utilisé un produit pendant dix, quinze ou vingt ans. Mais je pense qu'avec le nombre de produits nouveaux et toxiques qui sort sur le marché maintenant, je pense qu'il est peut-être temps où est-ce que le gouvernement amène des législations auprès des compagnies qui produisent ces nouveaux produits pour qu'ils ne les mettent pas sur le marché avant qu'ils puissent prouver qu'ils ont une façon efficace d'éliminer ces déchets-là. Et non pas les envoyer sur le marché puis OK nos petits enfants vont s'occuper de trouver une façon de les éliminer OK, mais peut-être de le regarder au début, OK.

On commence à parler de déchets toxiques, on est conscient de ça. Je pense que les gens commencent au travers de réunions comme celles-ci, commencent à être éduqués, puis c'est peut-être temps aussi que le gouvernement regarde à qu'est-ce qui se fait avant de ressortir d'autres produits nouveaux.

Un dernier point qui est peut-être une question qui reflète, je pense que c'est M. Assaff de la Ville de Bathurst qui est dans son rapport de tantôt. Il y a un évènement qui s'est passé l'hiver passé. Il y a deux mois environ où est-ce que durant une grève, pis j'prends pas parti d'un côté ou de l'autre, les égoûts de la ville ont été déversés dans le havre de Bathurst. On parlait tantôt dans ce rapport-là comment concerné la ville était à sauvegarder les crustacés du havre de Bathurst puis il nous a aussi mentionné comment dangereux qu'étaient les déchets qui étaient dans les égoûts de la ville, qu'il y avait des déchets toxiques mêlés avec les égoûts, avec les déchets publiques, puis ils ont quand même été les premiers à ouvrir puis à se servir du havre comme un dépotoir. Moi je pense que c'est dangereux, puis je pense que les poissons qui sont dans le fond, ils n'aiment pas mieux manger de la marde que moi. Ca fait que... j'sais pas si...

LAPIERRE:

Oui, j'vous remercie beaucoup de vos commentaires. Maintenant je crois que... est-ce qu'on pourrait peut-être vous poser quelques questions?

Premièrement comme citoyen, vous êtes un citoyen, vous êtes assez jeune, vous avez encore plusieurs années à vivre je crois dans votre région où vous semblez aimer bien. Est-ce que pour vous comme contribuable, est-ce que vous êtes prêts à défrayer les coûts que ça va occasionner, la protection de l'environnement? Parce qu'il n'y a pas question, on peut prévoir des systèmes mais tous les systèmes vont coûter de l'argent. Est-ce que comme contribuable, vous êtes prêt à défrayer les coûts?

F. CORMIER:

Au niveau, c'est peut-être à deux niveaux ça, au niveau des déchets de la maison ou domestiques on pourrait dire, au niveau de l'enfouissement ou du transport, là je pense que chaque citoyen devrait être responsable pour payer qu'est-ce que ça peut coûter. Moi je ne veux pas un dépotoir en arrière de ma cour qui n'est pas bien règlementé puis s'il faut que ça me coûte deux fois le prix que je paie maintenant, bien je pense que pour protéger mes enfants et moi-même puis mes voisins, moi je suis prêt à le faire.

Au niveau des déchets qui sont peut-être plus industriels si je peux utiliser le terme, je pense que les compagnies qui les produisent devraient défrayer le coût de l'entreposage ou de l'élimination de ces déchets-là et non pas le p'tit gars qui est à côté de l'usine qui n'a rien à faire avec ça. Celui qui en profite ou qui l'utilise devrait être responsable de payer pour l'élimination de ça.

LAPIERRE:

D'accord. Est-ce que je pourrais vous poser une autre question au sujet du transport des produits sur la route. Est-ce que j'ai bien compris que vous seriez en faveur que ces déchets soient bien indiqués. Est-ce que par exemple les camions que vous suivez sur la route, vous aimeriez qu'ils soient bien indiqués pour que vous puissiez connaître que c'est des produits toxiques. Il n'est peut-être pas possible de vous dire exactement quel produit qui se trouve à l'intérieur mais on pourrait vous dire que c'est un produit soit acide, alcalin ou bien dangereux. Est-ce que vous aimeriez comme citoyen savoir ça?

F. CORMIER:

Définitivement. Quoique je ne suis pas très connaissant mais je pense qu'il y a certains signes qui sont quand même communs. Il y a la fameuse croix sur la crâne, tout le monde sait que c'est un poison, les explosifs, si je suis un camion qui a un signe d'explosif en arrière c'est définitivement que je ne m'en vais pas le talonner à 25 pieds. J'vas soit le dépasser quand j'ai une chance ou me tenir loin assez derrière. J'pense que c'est vraiment important de savoir qu'est-ce qu'il y a sur le chemin.

LAPIERRE:

D'accord. J'aimerais poser une question à Mlle Godin maintenant. Je crois qu'actuellement, les placards qu'on place sur les camions sont placés dans le côté des camions. Est-ce qu'ils... c'est pas tellement pratique pour quelqu'un qui suit en arrière de la voiture.

GODIN:

Le règlement demande qu'il y ait des placards de placé sur les quatre côtés du camions. Il y a un problème. C'est que l'hiver comme vous le savez, la partie arrière du camion est couverte de sel et on ne les voit pas. J'ai suivi un camion moi-même après-midi puis j'essayais de voir quel produit il transportait justement pour voir au moins quelle classe puis je ne pouvais pas lire le placard. Finalement quand j'ai passé à côté, j'ai vu que c'était un corrosif. Mais le règlement demande des placards sur le devant, le derrière et les deux côtés.

LAPIERRE:

Merci. Moi aussi j'avais fait le même exercice depuis la dernière réunion pis j'ai pas pu voir ça fait que c'est possible qu'il était caché avec le sel. Est-ce que vous étiez conscient avant cette réunion ce soir qu'il y avait des... que les camions étaient identifiés sur la route. Est-ce que comme citoyez vous aviez déjà entendu parler de ça?

F. CORMIER:

Oui j'savais. J'sais pas à quel, jusqu'à quel niveau, j'peux pas tous les identifier mais je sais qu'il y a certains camions qui le sont. Ceux qui sont les explosifs par exemple, les produits chimiques, j'en ai vu sur la route moi-même. J'sais pas s'ils sont tous identifiés...

LAPIERRE:

Mais vous avez pas vu ça annoncé nulle part à la radio, à la télévision...

F. CORMIER:

Non nulle part. Ceux que j'ai vus c'était en me promenant sur la route.

LAPIERRE:

Pensez-vous que ça serait une bonne chose de les avoir à la télévision, de faire des annonces comme ça à la télévision, à la radio ou dans les journaux.

F. CORMIER:

Définitivement. Je pense qu'une partie pour régler le problème, c'est définitivement l'éducation par les entremises de réunions comme celles-ci, par l'entremise des médias, la télévision, la radio, à l'école même. Que ce soit les produits toxiques à la maison, j'veux dire il y a eu une grosse publicité pour démontrer que les enfants puissent voir, différencier entre un produit qui est poison et qui ne l'est pas. Je pense qu'au niveau des produits toxiques, la même chose pourrait être faite puis ça aurait probablement le même effet bénéfique.

LAPIERRE:

Vous êtes enseignant?

F. CORMIER:

Non.

LAPIERRE:

Bien, j'sais pas s'il y a d'autres questions. En tout cas je vous remercie pour votre ...

F. CORMIER:

Merci bien.

LAPIERRE:

Oui?

KENNY:

Yes Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I welcome you to Bathurst and getting the concerns of this ever growing monster as I see it, hazardous wastes and all the things that are connected with it. We are trying to deal with it and trying to handle it the best way of our knowledge and from time to time the thing that we thought was safe is not safe any more as we found out in asbestos and a few other things. But I have a few recommendations. Maybe they're good or bad but maybe they should be given some thought.

I know when working at Consolidated Bathurst, we had washing the pits and that, we had very strong chemicals that take the slime and that out of the pits making paper. nd I know the barrels were busted, rinsed out to the best of everybody's knowledge and then were dumped in a dumping ground. Now whether they are safe or clean enough, it's your idea or my idea but I think as good a job was done as we're doing washing up, I think we done it.

But I am in favor of vehicles being better marked, larger signs for identification purposes. And I think that there should be a toll free number that when a tanker is either going from Dalhousie to Saint John, or Dalhousie to Miramichi, or from Saint John to Quebec, with hazardous wastes you know, I think he should identify himself to EMO and the road he is taking. Because this is an ounce of prevention for anybody that has to deal with a spill.

They got the trucker's numbers and I think through the Emergency Measures Organization, they could have the waste or the effluents that he is hauling identified and possibly know how to cope with it and they know the road that he is taking. If he's going right up to Saint John River Valley, if he's coming out and going through Renous and up the other way that... There should be some restriction. Anybody coming in the Province, going somewhere or going out of the Province, there should be more identification and a truck route.

I know just recently that, I think Maine is talking about a nuclear waste plant and it's forty miles from New Brunswick. And they're certainly worried right there now about the waste that the Saint Croix area and I think some of the members are quite concerned as well as some of the individuals. I would hope that you would make a recommendation on that. I don't think it's too costly to have a toll free number and it should be government regulations that the trucker or the company identify himself, what he's hauling and where he's going and what road he's taking. Maybe he checks in when he goes across the weigh scales but sometimes he's not identifying his load maybe right to the letter of the law, I don't know, maybe he is.

As far as inspections and inspectors, I think you have six or seven in the region or in the Province but I think these inspectors, there is only one individual working for the environment. In the heat and the need and the demand in workload in the summertime, sometimes they are given a student, an extra set of hands but sometimes, they have quite a job to get some assistance which they need. They're only one individual and they have a big area here in Bathurst to cover. And I fought for students here different times and got them but I know you know, these inspectors can only do so much. You're only human. You only can travel one way at a time. You can't split yourself. He's doing as good a job as he can but maybe if he had some help, more help, he could do a better job. He can identify work out and his assistant can do it. And most of the time this is a young student, coming out of the college, following the same line. So he's getting some education on the way too, it's beneficial for him.

And another thing I ponder about, I think we make chemicals, we have PCB's and other hazardous wastes and all we've developed them into a chemical, why can't we break them down? We develop them so we got the technology to develop an oil, a gas and eventually becomes a hazardous waste, why can't we go the other way and try to neutralized them that they wouldn't be so hazardous. With the very smart individuals in college and that, I think we should start looking that route.

As far as burners, I think burners we're going to have to take a real long hard look at it. And burners are beneficial because they give off a lot of heat. And it cost a lot to heat a big building, it cost a lost to some areas they have them and they have big green cellars and they're certainly saving a lot of money heating these hot houses and that. So there's different things we can do with it and draw a little beneficial heat off of the exhaust and burning hazardous or not hazardous wastes but just wastes. And it will cut down the cost and we will be more efficient possibly in some of our large buildings which is quite a cost to heat them and keep them going.

So there's just a few points and...

LAPIERRE:

Well thank you very much for your suggestions. I'm sure that each suggestions is, all of your suggestions are certainly worthwhile and we will consider any suggestions. There are no suggestions that are not worthwhile. I'm sure all suggestions are worthwhile.

Just a comment on your chemicals. I think just a few weeks ago, the federal minister of the Environment has said publicly that from now on, chemicals would be much more closely scrutinized before they do go onto the market place. And I guess the technology to neutralize or destroy chemicals is present. What we need is the will to apply it. And I guess in the past, like much of our wastes, we haven't always put the effort in trying to rid ourselves or get rid of our wastes as we have in producing chemicals. So I think it's a matter of people, as a few individuals mentioned this evening, getting information and then, I'm sure with time, people will understand that they have to take care of these chemicals. When we decided to go to the moon, we found the tools, the technology to get there. I think that once we make it a priority to take care of our wastes, we will. It's just a matter of convincing a lot of people that needs to be done.

Are there any other individuals who would want to comment... or members of... Go ahead.

LANGMAID:

Thank you for your support on that nuclear waste dump. I happen to be on the committee opposing that. If you would like, I'll get you to sign the petition against it. But it's 26 miles from the border not 40. And it's in an unstable granite batholithe and the surface drainage flows into the Saint Croix River, above St. Stephen.

TAYLOR:

The gentleman mentioned a toll free number. I wonder if Miss Godin would inform us as to what rules and regulations there may be in place now regarding the transport of wastes, hazardous wastes or do we have any?

GODIN:

On July 1, 1985, the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations were implemented that govern the transportation of dangerous goods and hazardous wastes inter-provincially. It's a federal act which is in turn either adopted by the Provinces or the Provinces adopt a similar set of regulations to make the regulations applicable inside the Province.

New Brunswick has yet to sign an agreement with the federal government to implement the regulations for transportation inside the Province of New Brunswick. But we already have in place the manifest system for tracking down the hazardous wastes which are moving out of New Brunswick to either Quebec or Ontario or the States. That part of the regulation is already being implemented and being enforced. As far as the placarding of the transports and the information sources to tell people what their products are and how to respond, again, the placarding and the numbering system is mostly in place but the numbering system is mostly in place for the response team when there is an emergency. There is an office, Transport Canada has a 24 hour service, toll free number, which is Canutek, which is accessible by emergency response teams who can access anytime to get some information on any particular material that they encounter in the course of responding to a spill.

LAPIERRE:

Is this number available to the general public? Do they know about it or is it just to specialized teams?

GODIN:

I don't know.

PLAYFAIR:

Yes it is. The number can be acquired from your local fire departments in most respect especially in the Bathurst City Fire Department. Anybody that's interested in that toll free number, it can be made available to you just by a phone call.

That particular number is located in Ottawa. It is a small office section of a set-up by Transport Canada that handles all and every chemical that is available in Canada today. They can give you the emergency response guide, what to do immediately, they can give the response people the overall picture in regards to health, immediate health and danger, fire hazard, life hazard, explosion hazard. They can give that to you on a moment's notice. They're open 24 hours a day and have a telephone in the bathroom. They are a very dedicated bunch of people that I believe there are two New Brunswickers in that team that work out of that office and they work very diligently, very quickly and are very accurate in handling procedures.

They are open 24 hours a day like I said and are available for even practice exercise. In other words, if a fire department deems that it would like to simulate an exercise, and you can go through your emergency response guide with multiple amounts of chemicals and different treatments for different chemicals, they can tell you exactly what to do and which our department does on a regular basis.

SMITH:

So that is in response to mishap?

PLAYFAIR:

That is in response to mishaps.

SMITH:

I believe the expression reference up there to the number was for flight plans.

KENNY:

What I recommended is that when a truck or a transport is moving from a Saint John going in or out, that he, this toll free number, this operation should be identified that he's going up Saint John River Valley, he's leaving Saint John and he's going out the Edmundston way. And he's carrying X number of chemicals. So he'll have a route map so if any mishaps occur, which we hope never happens, that any fireman could call and say look this truck was coming up in the ditch, it's either a Speedway or somebody's Kerr's or some trucker, what does it contain? So they'll be able to give it to him.

PLAYFAIR:

Yes Paul. They can identify that, CanuTek will also have open lines to your environmental people in provincial areas. They also have open lines to different manufacturers. Once you identify who the transporter is, the type of transporter, the location, etc, they will contact the company for you and find out what exactly is in that particular truck.

They have, they do not have a copy of the documentation or the manifest or the bill of ladings that may be on different transporting vehicles but what they would be able to do would be to very accurately tell you what that company is transporting at that particular time, and they would do that through phones by Ottawa. So it gives us a good route and what to go by but I don't think the general public has a good knowledge of all that information that is available.

TAYLOR:

There is nothing in place yet to say that a transporter has to register when he leaves an area anywhere?

PLAYFAIR:

No there is not.

LAPIERRE:

Yes you would want to see it within New Brunswick?

GODIN:

I just wanted to pint out that with the transportation of dangerous goods and hazardous wastes, a pre-notification of every movement of every transport would not really have any effect because you would have so much paper work, you couldn't keep track. It would not really help you in your response to a spill.

SMITH:

How would this compare in volume to air traffic control?

GODIN:

I don't know.

SMITH:

We would expect more trucks and airplanes and they have an awful lot of air traffic controllers. I'm worried about the volume of employees we need for this job.

LAPIERRE:

With modern technology, maybe computers could help.

KENNY:

I think that if there's an office or a department set up, it's a matter of 24 hours and the trucker entering the Province or leaving a destination going someplace else. He calls this number and saying he's leaving Bathurst and he's going to Edmundston by a route...

SMITH:

What I mean though is... do you have any idea of how many trucks are carrying those dangerous placards in this Province right now?

KENNY:

There's quite a few.

SMITH:

Would you want to guess? I'd be scared to guess.

KENNY:

No, I wouldn't want to guess. But the whole trouble is, nobody knows what they're carrying or what routes they're taking and when you have to start checking back and sometimes it takes a little bit more time and I think New Brunswick should get in this program and start working with it.

GODIN:

I just want to point out that again, that some trucks that we see on the road every day and we're very familiar with and I don't know if people associate them with dangerous products or not and they should, or the gasoline trucks, the fuel oil, the ones that go to your home, everyday. Now those trucks are on the road all the time. If you document every movement of every truck, I just don't really see the logic of it because of the everyday traffic of chemicals that we use as consumers, gasoline and fuel oil being the main ones that come to mind, that are on the roads all the time and everywhere.

SMITH:

Perhaps another way to put it as I see it is the comparison between the traffic fatalities as a whole compared to the fatalities that are directly a result of this kind of thing that your system might avoid. I would think that you would have thousands of deaths compared to one death, you know and where do you stop... that's my problem.

KENNY:

Could the Panel have any figure on what it would cost per tonne or per gallon or so to transport this hazardous wastes outside of New Brunswick as long as we could? You know we could get ready for handling it but boy you know if we can move it outside to somebody else's backyard, why put it in ours?

LAPIERRE:

I don't have any figures but maybe Mme Godin has.

GODIN:

Transportation of dangerous goods, well of hazardous wastes is very expensive both the transportation cost and the treatment cost. Just to give you an example of something that I'm familiar with because as I've explained in some of the other cities, the Department of the Environment provides a service to schools and hospitals and we pick up some waste laboratory chemicals which we ship out to Ontario for proper disposal. And on average, 45 gallon drum of miscellaneous lab chemicals would cost $350-$400 So multiply that by the number of drums on a truck and it may give you an idea of the cost.

I'm not familiar with the cost for bulk transportation of liquid, I can probably get those but I don't have them off the top of my head.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you.

HILL:

I might be able to add to this. Just before coming up here this evening, this morning in fact, I was talking from a gentleman from Environment Canada in Fredericton. This was in relation to the story that some of you may have seen in the newspapers over the last day or two about the movement of the asbestos insulation which had been stored until very recently in the post office in Moncton. It was a new story I think yesterday or the day before to the effect that that material is now going to be moved from Moncton to a disposal facility in Quebec.

And in talking to the gentleman from Environment Canada this morning, he told me that the information he has from the federal department of Public Works is that the cost of the transportation of those 1,000 barrels of asbestos, keep in mind that we're talking a product which by our definition anyway would be considered a controlled waste rather than a hazardous waste.

But moving those 1,000 barrels of asbestos from Moncton to a disposal site in Quebec is going to cost $127,000. or essentially $127 per barrel - 1,000 barrels, we're talking $127,000 to move that material to Quebec. So we are talking about a very expensive business when you move waste products over long distance.

LAPIERRE:

OK, Well I guess ... Yes sir... No go ahead.

FRENETTE:

No it seems to me that the cost factor has come up a number of times quite numerous tonight and, I'm just wondering, does the Environment Canada have an operating budget or is it just... that would help defray some of the expenses incurred in probably directing these incinerators or to be of assistance to the various Province not only New Brunswick but across Canada in helping to alleviate the problems which we're faced with wastes.

LAPIERRE:

Well number one is I don't think that we have anyone here from Environment Canada. Miss Godin is from the department of the Environment of New Brunswick. But I don't know if she cares to answer whether she has a budget or her department has a budget to help move chemicals, and what it costs...

GODIN:

Just to get the feeling of what we can expect from Environment Canada, and they are or they have been in the past helping out, the incinerator in Charlottetown has been financed mostly by Environment Canada's money. A municipality the size of Charlottetown could never never to have an incinerator of the type that they have there. So it was heavily subsidized by Environment Canada money. I'm just looking at the latest announcements from Environment Canada which is that they're planning to cut I think it's 600 positions in the next 5 years so the money is getting very hard to get from any source.

LAPIERRE:

Sir, I wonder if you could use the mike when you speak. It's for recording purposes please.

FRENETTE:

It seems to me as if you just say that they have set a precedence and that they have been of assistance to the one in Charlottetown. New Brunswick being in the financial position that we are in now, it seems that maybe an effort should be made to acquire funds to ... either on a cost sharing level between the provincial and the federal government, if funds are available... Has that been looked into by the Province?

GODIN:

I'm not aware of any specific negotiations on any specific projects. Environment Canada is involved or was involved in providing funds for research technology to help set up a disposal or new ways of dealing with hazardous wastes or household or municipal wastes...

FRENETTE:

In other words, it becomes a political decision and if you happen to have a minister like they have in Charlottetown or in the Island, the funds are there.

GODIN:

I'm not sure what year the incinerator in Charlottetown was built but times are changing is all that I'm pointing out.

FRENETTE:

Yes, I know it's a time of restraint but...

GODIN:

And also in Quebec and, well not in Quebec but in Ontario and in Alberta, the development of hazardous wastes treatment facilities are being handled by Crown Corporations, Provincial Crown...

FRENETTE:

Provincial ones?

GODIN:

Yes.

FRENETTE:

But maybe the Council should make a recommendation of some sort to look into the possibility probably if funds are available to be of assistance to the Province and in solving some of the problems we have in erecting these incinerators and also in problems or relocating our landfill.

GODIN:

I couldn't agree with you more. We should get the money wherever we can get it. OK.

LAPIERRE:

Sir, I wonder if you would care to response to a question that I've brought up many times but it's the user-pay concept or the polluter-pay concept. If you produce waste, you pay for what it costs to dispose of it whether you're an individual or a corporation.

FRENETTE:

Well again, I'm speaking as an individual. I'm not representing the Chaleur Industrial Commission because we're trying to promote industry. No, I feel that if industry should be asked to contribute to solving some of the problems which they are creating. Certainly if we have to proceed in the user fees, probably that should be one avenue and possibly like I said a while ago the, looking into the matter of federal funds being available even if it is a time of restraint, I think that should be looked into also.

LAPIERRE:

Yes, I'm not saying that we don't look into ... I was just asking the alternative, the other side.

FRENETTE:

No, I agree that user fees that because... No doubt the problems that are being created are being created, the major ones I should say, are being created by industry but through proper controls, maybe these could be eliminated. But certainly if they have to be, the only way they can be controlled, rectified or solved, if it means user fees, I think that's the direction probably we should go.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you. Are there any other comments? Yes sir...

ASSAFF:

My comment further on incineration, I feel on the, as far as non-hazardous wastes, especially those hard to get rid off chemicals as we refer to PCB's, etc. that any incineration of wastes should be, lets say user fee in that it should pay for itself without any type of subsidization. Now a question that I have is that I'm not aware of what the capital cost where the construction in the Charlottetown incinerator and I would be very interested to know.

My question is, I recently read in an Environment Canada newsletter that they had made savings of approximately $900,000 in the past year in energy savings and it's energy which they were selling to local hospitals I believe. I consider that to be a large amount of money for perhaps a city the size of Charlottetown and perhaps the surrounding areas or perhaps even the whole island. Now I've been a representative on two advisory commissions in the last two years to do with a regional solid waste disposal and on both of those commissions there were much discussions had on incineration versus sanitary landfilling. And it's been my experience that the Department of the Environment is very closed on the idea of incineration and I can't understand why. But we have never gotten ...firstly and

Secondly that we should ... a landfilling as much as possible because it's the cheapest but I don't understand is why it can be a valuable concern in Charlottetown, and I understand that it's doing real well because recent studies by the Environment Canada on emissions at this plant have proven to be very very successful, well within the guidelines, more than they expected. I can't understand incineration cannot be applied in regional landfills around the Province. And I would like to have some comments on that if I could.

LAPIERRE:

OK, thank you very much. I wonder if Paul Monti from the Department of the Environment would care to comment on ... or Madame Godin on incineration versus landfill. It's a question I always have asked myself also.

MONTI:

I don't think I'm really qualified to comment on one versus the other except to say that to my knowledge the studies that have been done investigating the cost of, capital cost involved in incineration are prohibitive in New Brunswick.

LAPIERRE:

You wouldn't have an idea of the cost of the plant in Charlottetown? Yes Gerry...

HILL:

I'll give a try at it. I'll start by saying that as you know, as you all well know, there will be another three meetings in this series next week including one in Fredericton. One of the things we can do without any difficulty is to arrange to have someone from our department to has specific expertise in this issue come to the meeting next week in Fredericton and answer the question about capital cost in Charlottetown specifically so as to get those on the records. So I can make that commitment tonight to ensure that someone is at the meeting at Fredericton next week so as to get that on the record.

With specific regards to the Charlottetown situation, I'll try to the extent that I have the information. I was involved three years ago in a conference that some of you may have been at at the University of Moncton on Resource Recovery in the Atlantic Provinces at which a presentation by the general manager of the incineration project at Charlottetown was made. My memory of that presentation and it's rather rough at the moment, my memory is that the capital cost of that project was in the $20 to 30 million range. Now that's just off the top of my head. And I may be a fair bit off there.

Nevertheless, what I do remember the gentleman saying was that they has a unique opportunity in Charlottetown and that related to, first of all, the availability of a site. They had a site which was owned by the government, assumably by the muniucipal government and perhaps by the province which was adjacent to a major consumer for the energy which I believe was the hospital. Again, I'm trying to remember from two or three years ago this presentation but the key as I understood it at the time was that they have a site which they could use for the construction of an incinerator which was very proximate to the consumer for the energy. So the short distance involved in moving the energy from burning the garbage to the eventual consumer was one of the key factors which made it an economically viable, quote un quote, project.

This was also a project which was developed in the late 1970's at which time as we all remember in Canada there was a significant amount of government funding available from the federal level during the so called Off Oil Program. This was in response to the energy crisis of the early 1970's. There were significant financial incentives from the federal level to reduce Canadian's dependence on oil-fired energy. And through a combination of the availability of those grants, I believe, from the federal department of Energy, Mines and Resources under the off oil program and the fact that there was a consumer for the power in very close proximity to a site which existed.

In other words, it was not a site which they had developed from scratch, they already had it. And it was very close to the source of a, you know, major consumer for the steam from the power plant. So those various factors combined to make it what was perceived in the late 1970's when there was a significant amount of funds available from the federal level for off oil program and energy generation to be what was considered at that time viable.

Whether it would be viable today is another question but my memory is that it was a unique circumstance. There was money available from the federal level for Off Oil, there was a site which they already had and there was a major consumer for the energy. And the three combining factors made it possible at that time.

LAPIERRE:

Yes Sir... Thank you Gerry.

ASSAFF:

I don't want to get involved in a cost argument here because I really don't know what the capital costs were but in the recent study performed on the regional landfill in the Bathurst area, one of the portions of the study were to evaluate the cost of an incinerator and this was done by consulting engineers. Now I have to, I don't want to be quoted on the cost business, it's been a while since I've read the report. And also it was done at a very preliminary level, we were talking about somewhere near $4 Million.

Right now, like I said, maybe it's the Volkswagon, all right, and not the Cadillac that's going to burn maybe a bit more. But I'm confused and hopefully at the next session, we'll hear through the media what some of the answers to some of these questions are. This cost I'm referring to also included a landfilling of the ash afterwards right.

LAPIERRE:

Was that the heat recovery also?

ASSAFF:

And they had no allowance for heat recovery, alright? Now the operating cost was less than the operating cost of a sanitary landfill but the capital cost were higher and it took no consideration of any heat recovery, right? But anyway, what bothers me is the concept is always discarded because no one seems to really want to look at it because the first impression is always that it's too expensive. But I don't really believe, and I'm talking provincially too, anybody has really sat down to do a real analysis on it.

I really personally believe that provincial agencies have a closed mind on incineration and maybe it's because they don't have the expertise in this area and maybe they should acquire it. Because incineration a least will do one thing. It will get rid with the dangers associated with waste products as oppose to hiding it or burying it in the ground for other generations to cope with.

LAPIERRE:

Thank you very much sir. Very interesting comment.

HILL:

If by way of response just two quick points. I certainly don't have the expertise so I hope I made it clear before I made my comments that I don't claim to have any expertise on this specific capital costs. I was doing it from memory and I may be way off and I can assure you that we will have people at the meeting in Fredericton to clarify the point.

I could also mention just in passing that you don't have to necessarily depend on news media coverage of the meeting in Fredericton to get that information. The reason that we're all standing at microphones here, is that this meeting is being transcribed. We're going to produce detailed verbatim transcripts of all these meetings. Those transcripts will be automatically mailed to everyone who made a presentation. So you as a presenter will automatically get a great load of information sometime in April that you can burn in your fireplace maybe, but. So those transcripts will be available and everyone will have a chance to go through them and check the details.

I guessed, I was clearly guessing, I hope I made it clear on the figure. I may be off. There's no doubt that if you get into a heat recovery system, which this was, this Charlottetown situation is one where they're producing energy I believe with steam and then shipping it essentially across the street to the hospital, that that is a pretty expensive operation. But let's leave it until Wednesday and we'll clarify the point, we'll get the information to you.

LAPIERRE:

Are there any other comments? Yes sir.

P. CORMIER:

... the responsibility of your committee to find out what we want or how much it's going to cost for what we want?

LAPIERRE:

No we just listen to everything you have to say. If it's cost you tell us and if you know, and then if we don't know what it costs, we try to find out.

P. CORMIER:

I really think that the only thing that you people are out for is to find out what we want and present your report.

LAPIERRE:

That's true.

P. CORMIER:

Then it's somebody else's responsibility to try and finance it.

LAPIERRE:

I agree. Our main task is to listen to you and take back your comments and that's what we will do.

SMITH:

We are operating from an information base though. The documentation that is in the front hall is... that you've been able to pick up tonight is basically the policy that the government feels is the way to go. And the government has asked us to go out and show it to people and try to answer some of the questions and answer some of them later even and mixes in with the plan as the saw it so far.

Now one of the things was, that I remember stated in there, was simply that why spend a whole lot of money with a plan that nobody will accept. So if... that's part of what we're looking for.

LAPIERRE:

Are there any other comments or questions... Yes Ken.

LANGMAID:

Gerry, there was a study two or three years ago in Fredericton that they were going to supply the hospital there with heat and UNB. Now, as I remember, they decided it was too expensive or something like that. Could we get the figures on that at that time or some comment on that next Wednesday so we'll have something to compare with.

HILL:

Yes certainly. There was indeed a concept at one time that burning Fredericton's garbage in the central heating plant at UNB rather than oil would be a reasonable way to supply energy to the University. The ultimate decision, as I understand it was not to go that way and we can get details next week on that. I believe, and Paul may correct me on this, I believe that there is some degree of wood chips, wood waste burning in that incinerator now, Is that not correct? So they are not burning strictly oil to heat UNB at the moment at the central heating plant in the city. There is at least some components of the fuel supplying UNB power now which is coming from wood chips.

LAPIERRE:

Are there any other comments? Well I guess that the night has moved on. It's twenty after ten so I guess if there are no further comments, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you all for having come here tonight. I'm sure that your comments will be taken, will be heard, will be registered. As you know in a democracy, we can't always put forward our ideas. The ideas that go forward are often times, are supposed to be the ones that represent the majority of citizens. The majority of the citizens that are concerned with wastes and wastes disposal and hazardous wastes transportation, I'm sure that we will get a better policy and we will see to a safe disposal of our waste products and leave a safe and clean environment for the generations that will follow us and I think that's all what we aim to do. So in that, I think that I will thank you all and have a safe journey home.